

REMARKS

Claim 8 was objected to because of an informality. Claim 19 was objected to because of an informality. Claims 1 to 4, 8, 9, 11 to 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ueda et al. (US 5,690,435). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Graushar et al. (US 6,267,366). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Isaac et al. (US 5,483,893). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Rothman (US 2004/0111597). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Kikinis (US 6,137,591). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Pepperl + Fuchs.

Claims 8 and 19 have been amended solely to correct informalities and entry of the amendments is respectfully submitted.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claims 8 and 19 were objected to because of informalities. Both claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner to correct the informalities. Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing these out. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1 to 4, 8, 9, 11 to 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ueda et al. (US 5,690,435).

Claim 1 recites: “A method for detecting a type of one of a plurality of devices attached to a graphics machine, each device being one of at least a first type and a second type, the method comprising:

detecting at a controller the type of device attached to or to be attached to the machine, the controller being capable of preadjusting the device as a function of the detection.”

The Office Action asserts that the two types of machines are a carriage driving motor 18 of Ueda, and a reflecting plate 41 of Ueda.

The Office Action then cites the abstract and various sections of Ueda to assert that controller 44 or 110 detects the type of device attached to or to be attached to the machine.

However, the controller 44 does not detect the **type of device** with respect to motor 18, but rather merely detects its rotational angle. See col. 4, lines 24 to 27.

Controller 44 also does not detect the type of device with respect to reflecting plate 41, but rather a species of the printing ribbon. (See col. 4, lines 52 to 55).

As admitted by the Office Action, the asserted two types of devices in Ueda are motors and printing ribbons.

Controller 44 cannot detect whether or not the motor 18 is a motor or a printing ribbon, just as it cannot determine if the reflecting plate 41 indicates a printing ribbon or motor. The controller already assumes that the motor 18 is fixed in a certain location and that a printing ribbon is in the other location.

Claim 1 requires that “detecting at a controller the type of device attached to or to be attached to the machine, the controller being capable of preadjusting the device as a function of the detection.” Ueda does not perform any type detection.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 to 4, 8, 9, 11 to 15 and 19 is respectfully requested.

With further respect to claim 4, claim 4 recites “wherein the devices can be added or removed and replaced with other devices of other types.” There is absolutely no indication or disclosure in Ueda that motor 18 can be replaced with a device of another type, or with any other device at all.

Claim 8 recites a graphics machine comprising:

a controller;

a first device connected to the controller, the first device being categorizable as one of at least a first type and a second type, the controller detecting the type of the first device; and

a memory accessible by the controller, the memory storing information regarding the first type and the second type;

wherein the controller automatically adjusts the first device as a function of the information.

Again, the Office Action is asserting that the two types are motors and ribbons. Ueda does not have a “memory storing information regarding the first type and second type” as claimed, as no information regarding motors is stored at all.

With further respect to claim 15, claim 15 recites the machine as recited in claim 8 wherein the controller has a plurality of inputs, each input identifying a particular location of the machine.

Ueda does not “identify” any location at all.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Graushar et al. (US 6,267,366). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Isaac et al. (US 5,483,893). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Rothman (US 2004/0111597). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Kikinis (US 6,137,591).

In view of the above comments with respect to claims 1 and 8, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 5, 6, 7, and 16 to 18 is respectfully requested.

In addition, with respect to claim 16, claim 16 recites the machine as recited in claim 9 wherein the type identifier is a plug having an input power pin and at least one other pin, the first type or second type being identified by a connection between the power pin and the other pin. There is no identification which occurs on Kikinis and it is not clear which two types are being referred to in Kikinis.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940